DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 264 644 EA 018 048

AUTHOR Goldsberry, Lee; And Others
TITLE Principals' Thoughts on Supervision.
PUB DATE 85
NOTE 42p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 31-April 4, 1985).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Data Analysis; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Interviews; *Research Methodology; Supervisors; *Supervisory Methods; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Supervision
IDENTIFIERS Pennsylvania; *Survey of Supervisory Practices

ABSTRACT

Analysis of the responses to telephone and personal interviews by 21 teacher supervisors from six school districts in Pennsylvania revealed three possible patterns of direct supervision of teachers. "Nominal" supervision consists of voicing compliance with statutory requirements for observation of teaching, a clear focus on identifying and eliminating substandard teaching, and a view of the supervisor as "quality control inspector." "Patterned" supervision uses a highly structured system of observation and communication to help all teachers improve teaching beyond state-mandated minimums, follow uniform teaching procedures, and make improvements in areas other than those affected by other interventions. "Integrated" supervision combines patterned supervision with other approaches to professional development and adapts the process to the specific needs of the setting and the teachers served. This report describes the supervisory and staffing patterns followed in each of the districts studied, places the study in the context of a larger study of supervisory practices in Pennsylvania, and explains the study's planning and interviewing methods. (Confidentiality was preserved by giving the districts fictional names). The development of techniques for analyzing the data are described, with supporting evidence from the interviews. The complete interview questionnaire and selected responses are presented in appendixes. (PGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Lee Goldsberry
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PRINCIPALS' THOUGHTS ON SUPERVISION

Lee Goldsberry, Robert Mayer, and Paulette Harvey

AERA 1985

A task becomes a duty from the moment you suspect it to be an essential part of that integrity which alone entitles a man to assume responsibility. (Dag Hammarskjold)

THE DISTRICTS

Avery School District is small and rural. One building houses its K-12 operation. The administrative staff of Avery consists of the secondary principal and the superintendent. All the managerial and curricular leadership functions of the district — including classroom observations -- are shared by these two men.

Barton School District, like Avery, has only one rural campus to serve its student clientele. Unlike Avery, Barton has separate buildings and principals for elementary and secondary students. Except for the two principals, the only administrator with any responsibility for the academic program is the district superintendent.

Carr School District, which serves a small town and rural populace, consists of four elementary schools of varying sizes feeding into a central middle school and, in turn, into a central high school. The superintendent at Carr has two other central office administrators and a centralized reading supervisor who assist with the academic program. Both secondary schools have a principal and an assistant principal; two elementary principals manage the four elementary buildings.

Diablo School District serves its "metropolitan" clientele with three secondary schools -- two of which feed into a single senior high school. The district also includes several neighborhood elementary schools each administered by a building principal; although, as at Carr, some principals serve more than one building. The secondary schools each have a full-time principal and assistant principal. In addition to the superintendent, several central office administrators share responsibility for the district's academic program.

ED264644

EA 018 018

Elbe School District is a county-wide system serving rural and small town clienteles. Four high schools, each with a discrete feeder system, make up the district. Three of these high schools serve grades 7 through 12, while the fourth (located in the county seat) is fed from a local junior high school. Typically, an Elbe secondary school is managed by both a principal and an assistant principal; however, at least one school has only a building principal. Some elementary schools have a principal; some have a head teacher who performs administrative chores in addition to full-time classroom teaching. Supervision of elementary teachers is conducted by two central office educators whose primary function is the supervision/staff development of the district's elementary teachers. At the secondary level supervision remains a function of the principal. Two central office administrators and personnel specifically charged with supporting vocational-technical, reading and special education in addition to the superintendent and the two elementary supervisors share responsibilities for the district's educational program.

Farr School District is also a county-wide system. On the surface it is very similar to Elbe, with three rather than four secondary schools. Farr does charge elementary principals with supervision of teachers. And, again, some principals are responsible for more than one building. Farr has much less central office support than Elbe; only one assistant aids the superintendent with the educational program.

Although the names are fictional and some details purposely vague or omitted for reasons of confidentiality, these are six real school districts. Each participated in an investigation exploring supervisory practices involving both surveys and interviews. This report addresses findings from interviews of twenty-one supervisors in these six districts regarding the structure and function of supervision provided for teachers.

As you might imagine from the variability of the size, organizational structure, and staffing patterns in these districts, the supervision reported is far

from uniform. From the supervisory practices reported in these six districts we will suggest three different patterns of direct supervision for teachers which we have labeled "nominal," "patterned," and "integrated." Although there are surely variations within each of these patterns, we will suggest characteristics which we think define clear differences among them. Furthermore, within each of these district-wide patterns of supervision we believe supervisors may conceive of supervision as either a set of tasks which come with the job, or as a personally inherent duty which gives the job personal meaning and importance. Of course this conception of supervision is neither readily dichotomous, as we shall paint it, nor completely independent of the environment in which this supervision must occur. We shall suggest some relationship between the pattern of supervisory approach and the supervisor's personal conception of supervision, as well as suggest structural factors which we believe have a strong influence on both. Interspersed in the text are excerpts from the interviews -- in these "I:" indicates an utterance of the interviewer and "S:" indicates a response from a supervisor.

If the reader concludes that this paper goes well beyond our data to suggest patterns and conceptions of supervision, then we salute your reasoning. Indeed, it does. The present study is one component of a much larger exploration focusing on supervisory practices or beliefs which influence the amount and quality of organizational efforts to improve instruction through direct observation of and communication with teachers. (See Goldsberry, et al., 1984; Harvey and Goldsberry, 1984; Harvey, Goldsberry, and Mayer, 1985). The purpose of the investigation reported here is to examine supervisors' responses to a structured interview in an attempt to identify patterns which may, after further investigation and clarification, develop into generalizable categories of such supervisory practices. To do this, we: 1) developed a long-range plan to explore and document those practices associated with direct supervision of classroom teachers as perceived by

teachers and their supervisors; 2) developed an interview format and schedule; 3) identified supervisors to be interviewed; 4) collected the interview data; 5) wondered how the hell we were going to make sense from the data; 6) drew our conclusions in the form of categories of supervisory patterns in districts and conceptions of supervision; and 7) suggested some hypotheses based on these conclusions. Each of these steps is discussed below. It is our hope that our efforts will be of some value to future research and to those whose "duty" includes making schools as conducive as possible for educating youth.

THE LONG-RANGE PLAN

The professional literature on instructional supervision (e.g., Alfonso, Firth and Neville, 1980; Seriovanni and Starratt, 1983) offers abundant theory and guidance regarding how classroom teaching and, ultimately, student learning might be improved through conscientious and able supervision. Although the various authors differ considerably in the attention they devote to the systematic observation of classroom teaching and related communication between supervisor and teacher, there is uniform agreement that this "direct" or "clinical" component of supervision is crucial. Still, countless practitioners and a few writers (e.g., Sullivan, 1980, Brandt, 1982) suggest the practices associated with clinical supervision of teachers rarely occur in "real schools." But, apart from Lovell's (1980) study of supervisory practices in Tennessee (which clearly supports the assertion that clinical supervision as advocated in the literature is quite rare in schools), little evidence as to the current state of supervisory practice in schools was available.

Therefore, a three-tiered investigation of supervisory practices in central Pennsylvania was conceived in 1981. The first tier, consisting of administering, analyzing, and reporting results from the Survey of Supervisory Practices (SSP) to

over 1,000 teachers and their supervisors was completed in late 1983 (Goldsberry, et al., 1984). The second tier consisted of follow-up interviews of supervisors included in the first tier investigation in order to embellish the "bones" of survey data and to examine consistency between survey and interview data (Harvey, Goldsberry, and Mayer, 1985). This report, then, belongs to the second tier. The third tier, a planned intensive examination of instructional improvement in a single district, is proceeding slowly. An expansion of the survey (SSP) data base to include an estimated 10,000 Pennsylvania teachers and their supervisors is also underway. We gratefully acknowledge the support of the Pennsylvania Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and the cooperation of Pennsylvania's 29 Intermediate Units for the statewide study.

Tier one SSP findings revealed that supervisory practices varied considerably in a relatively small geographical area. Would supervisors' views of supervision differ as markedly? Would district size predict systematic variation in supervisors' views? What obstacles would supervisors report inhibited their ability to supervise as they would like? Would supervisors report different visions of "ideal" supervision? These questions and others suggested a need for an expansion on SSP data from supervisors. Would supervisors respond to interviews any differently than they did to a survey instrument? Would a comparison of the two data sources produce complementary or contradictory impressions? These questions, too, influenced the design of the interview.

The interview was designed to be conducted using a skeletal "script" (See Appendix A). This script included short answer items designed to correspond with SSP items (which we later decided were more characteristic of a telephone survey than of an interview -- see Harvey, et al., 1985) and concluded with a set of open-ended questions designed to capture the interviewee's perceptions of existing supervisory practices, ideal supervisory practices, and obstacles to supervision in her/his work environment. The script was termed "skeletal" because, although each

interviewer was to include each question, probing questions to gain clarification or elaboration of responses was encouraged.

The plan was to conduct the interview at a prearranged time via the telephone. Most interviews were consistent with this intent. Some, however, were conducted at face-to-face meetings.

THE SUPERVISORS

Initially, the plan was to interview supervisors from each of the seven districts that participated in the survey (SSP). When the time came to identify the specific supervisors to interview, however, two districts were eliminated from consideration due to low return rates from the SSP. Three of the elementary supervisors from one of these discarded districts (Diablo) were interviewed in the pursuit of a separate research line -- see Harvey and Goldsberry, 1984. These three interviews were included in the data base reported in this paper. In the smaller districts (Avery and Barton) all supervisors were interviewed. In other districts (except Diablo as discussed above) both elementary and secondary supervisors were selected. When deciding which of a district's principals to interview, the research team randomly selected from elementary and from secondary pools. In cases where unusual staffing patterns existed (as in Elbe's elementary program), all supervisors were interviewed. In all, 25 supervisors were selected to be interviewed.

COLLECTING THE DATA

Data were collected by three separate interviewers during the 1982-1983 school year and during the summer of 1983. Twenty of the 25 interviews were done over the telephone; the remaining five were done in person by a single interviewer. The crude technology used to record telephone interviews failed to compensate for

the variation in signal strength between interviewer and supervisor -- resulting in frustration for the people who tried to transcribe the tapes. Perseverance prevailed yielding 21 usable data sets -- only four interviews were inaudible to the point of being unusable. The data base, therefore, consisted of 21 transcriptions of audio recordings made of primarily telephone interviews of supervisors in six school districts who had previously participated in the SSP.

BEFUDDLEMENT

So, what do you do with 21 transcriptions to reduce approximately 300 pages of single-spaced typescript to a meaningful and hopefully cogent interpretation? Well, we tried different things. We tried a content analysis scheme in which responses to interview items were sorted into predefined categories. We each tried to predict independently what interviewees' responses would be to selected survey items (with a three-way agreement rate of 82%). Finally, after each contributing author had read each interview, Bob Mayer suggested that each district had its own distinct flavor that could be categorized into one of three discrete patterns. Seemed right. Discussion produced characteristics for each supervisory pattern and common agreement as to the supervisory pattern for each district. More on that follows.

While the district pattern for supervisory services remained relatively stable within each district, individual supervisor attitudes and commitment did not. This suggested to us that the conception of supervision held by each supervisor interacted with the district's supervisory pattern. This notion, too, is elaborated later. In short, finally we concluded that each interview was an interaction of themes and points which defied fragmentation through structural content analysis. The only method for reducing such data networks seemed to be to use ourselves as interpreters of the raw data -- drawing seeming patterns from the interviews as

wholes. While we did compare our interpretations in an attempt to serve as mutual "checks and balances," we cannot be certain that our procedures prevented any systematic biases we brought to the task. We invite you, the reader, to offer suggestions as to means to reduce bias in interpreting these data. We resorted, as is apparent, to suggesting hypotheses which must stand for further scrutiny to garner much credibility.

THE CONCLUSIONS AS HYPOTHESES

Based upon our interpretation of these findings we hypothesize that:

HYPOTHESIS I: Three discrete patterns of direct supervisory support for teachers exist in schools. We call these nominal, patterned, and integrated.

DEFINITION I: Nominal supervision consists of voicing compliance with statuatory requirements for observation of teaching, a clear focus on identifying and eliminating substandard teaching, and a view of supervisor as "quality control inspector."

Apparently, nominal supervision exists to "fix" inferior teachers; we could find no evidence that any supervisor had initiated dismissal proceedings for any teacher. There is some indication that supervisors using a nominal approach perceive they are helping beginning and marginal teachers improve. Typically, it is the supervisor in the nominal system who decides who needs to change and what the change should be.

I: How many of the teachers who were supervised...last year actually changed their teaching because of supervision?

S: I think I'd have to qualify that. I would say almost all of the teachers that I have wanted to change have made an attempt at change.

Generally, in a nominal system "master teachers" are perceived as needing no supervision beyond some forms of assurance that they are indeed teaching the district's curriculum.

I: Given the conditions you have to work in, what are your objectives for supervision then?

S: ...Let's take an example. I have three different people teaching 10th grade English. I feel that I am obliged to see to it that all those different kids are getting the same dose of medicine.

I: Earlier, you mentioned that like 15 of your faculty were master teachers, and ten needed improvement, how does the supervision for these two groups of teachers differ then?

S: Well, I'm afraid I don't do a whole lot with those master teachers. I take them for granted. They do go ahead and do their usual good job. And I just don't do a whole lot with them.

I: So then, the ones that need improvement are the ones that you focus most of your time on and you work through and use a clinical approach with them?

S: Yes.

Even though the nominalist supervisor reports spending less time observing and conferring with teachers, she/he still reports "time" to be the major obstacle to delivering supervision.

I: As you see it, what are the major problems or obstacles that affect supervision in your school?

S: Not only in my school, but I think in a lot of secondary schools, the main problem is having the personnel to do it. (At) this school I do not have an assistant under me. And many times if I don't say, "I'm observing; I don't want to be disturbed," I'm disturbed. And, I think a lot of principals may say that also. I know there are school districts who have people who do nothing but supervision at the secondary level, and I think that particularly is the way to go. This district does not see it that way. This district says we want a principal to do a lot of supervision, but — as anyone should know — the prinicpal has a lot of managing and (has to deal with) so many problems (that) you can't really address yourself to saying that supervision is — today I'm going to be a supervisor -- or at the third period every day -- or whatever.

HYPOTHESIS 2: In some districts and in some schools staffing patterns and multiple demands on supervisor demand a <u>nominal</u> approach to supervision.

Especially in the smaller districts of Avery and Barton, supervisors are persuasive in conveying the notion that multiple demands on their time preclude

anything but a nominal approach to supervision. Recall that the superintendent of Avery is the supervisor for district elementary teachers. When this set of studies was in its infancy and this superintendent was asked to volunteer his district as a study site, he at first demurred, stating that he was quite aware that elementary teachers in Avery received less supervisory support than they should. He agreed to participate only when the investigator argued that researchers, writers, and policy makers concerned with supervision ought to be aware of his situation. Another supervisor in one of these small districts put it this way:

S: ...The law says we have to observe (nontenured teachers) twice (a year) and the other teachers once. I pop in the classroom and maybe just spend ten minutes. And, I don't have that much information, but I would say that on the average — I don't do as much as I should because I'm also athletic director, transportation director, and anything else (in addition to being high school principal) — I probably average...three (observations of)...any teacher who is not tenured, and probably, at the most, two (observations of other teachers). That might be a little bit high on the older teachers -- teachers that I've had teaching for 34 years. There's no way I'm going to be spending a lot of time with them.

DEFINITION 2: Patterned supervision entails a highly structured system of observations and related communication clearly intended to help all teachers improve teaching that: goes well beyond state-mandated minimums; emphasizes procedural uniformity; and is functionally unrelated to other instructional improvement interventions.

Patterned supervision consists of a regimen; each teacher is supervised using the same set of procedural steps. These steps and the focus within them may related to the district's personnel evaluation scheme, but have no connection to staff development programming, to curriculum devlopment, or to any other instructional improvement mechanism. Although not necessarily delivered to all teachers at the same time (i.e., not all teachers are observed within the same school year), it is designed to be used with all teachers over time -- beginning and experienced, master and marginal. Typically, the supervisor in a patterned approach

sees direct supervision as an important function, especially for new or "weak" teachers and for teachers who perceive they have "problems." The role of diagnostician of "weaknesses" still seems emphasized by the patterned supervisor, although the notion of teacher "self-analysis" does begin to appear. "Clinical supervision" was the label supervisors attached to this approach emphasizing technical procedures; we refer to it as "patterned supervision" because we believe it lacks some essential characteristics of "clinical supervision."

S: ...When I want to work with somebody with clinical supervision, I ask anything about teaching they dislike--or is there anything about the classroom teaching part that they don't like. That bugs them, you know.

I: Sort of a problem-solving thing?

S: Right. So that we can kind of work together on it. Or, sometimes, going in to observe them when they knew I was coming and if I see something that bothered me, I'll ask them if it bothered them -- you know, that that happened. Would they like to work on that, you know, with me.

S: I think my primary objective would be to help people improve their teaching. I see improvement as the cornerstone, you know. That's very general — very broad. And, what you mean about improvement is probably -- everyone has their own opinion about that. But I really see that as a supervisor you're in a very crucial position to try to influence people -- you know, to help them improve and ultimately provide a good education for these kids. I feel that's where the bottom line is here.

S: I think the most important thing as far as we're concerned is to self-analyze. I think the improvement will come by their (the teachers') own efforts, but I think <u>if we have analyzed and pointed out the weaknesses,</u> then I think it becomes a very important part of the teacher's job to — if possible, to suggest ways they can improve it.

Patterned supervision in the two districts where we found it is a recently implemented, district-wide approach to supervision. As such, it does not enjoy uniform support from supervisors charged with delivering it. Indeed, one gets the

impression on occasion that some supervisors in a patterned system are nominalists who are forced out of comfortable routines.

S: What happens is...our superintendent has put a lot of pressure on us and has made (classroom observation) a top priority. So, some other stuff has gone by the wayside because he has a high priority. Therefore, we have to do it. I do what I'm told.

I: Do you view supervision as a doable job under the conditions of your work?

S: ...No, I don't. I think I put the time in at it because I'm required to do it and we do have...I guess it goes back to that old term -- we're "snooper-vision" supervisors.

HYPOTHESIS 3: Patterned supervision is often a transitional approach designed to emphasize the importance of instructional improvement as part of the supervisor's function.

HYPOTHESIS 4: Patterned supervision is sometimes resented by the supervisors whose expertise and commitment are essential for it to succeed.

Bob Anderson (one of the Goldhammer, Anderson, and Krajewski fellows) has referred to the clinical supervision approach he describes as a "training model." Although clinical supervision may seem like a highly structured set of "stages" and procedures on the surface, that may be akin to seeing teaching as a perfunctory and ritualistic series of prescribed "steps." The purpose of a training model seems to be to foster awareness of a set of often useful procedures so that a thinking person can employ them, or adapt them, as needed in any given situation. In the two districts where we found patterned supervision, it seemed to signal a shift away from a nominal approach to supervision. The sense one gets from talking to policy-makers in these districts (and, unfortunately, not captured in the interviews with supervisors) is one of "we're getting there -- you should have seen where we came from." Given a study as modest as ours it may simply be an atypical coincidence that "patterned supervision" is found in districts in transition, while integrated

supervision is more "settled in." We hypothesize otherwise. Furthermore, if patterned approaches are transition strategies, it is unsurprising that resistance is detected among the flock. Meaningful change in schools seems inevitably accompanied by conflict over the desirability and process of the change.

HYPOTHESIS 5: Because patterned supervision requires supervisor's job time to deliver, and because most supervisors perceive it important for them to be available rapidly in case of "emergencies" which occur frequently, the lack of time is seen by supervisors as a powerful obstacle to patterned supervision.

I: As you see it, what are the major problems or obstacles that affect supervision in your school? For you it's really "in your schools."

S: Yes, that's the problem I'm dealing with...Given the fact that I deal with (multiple) schools, okay, I am not there all the time...My greatest obstacle (is) being in one place...I'm not there on need if the teacher wants to call me in for this particular lesson or something. And, I find that to be a hardship in my current situation. And, I'm sure you're running across other people who have two or three schools.

I: Yeah...It's very difficult. I taught in a situation where the principal had four buildings, and, you know, there's a rule that says you will be in (one school) when you're needed in (another). Do you see any other things that have an effect on it?

S: Time.

I: Why is time such a problem?

S: With the various and sundry things that happen during the day, you are a problem-solver and, the number one job I think, trouble shooter. You've got to cure all the little ills of the day -- and, by the time that's done, all of a sudden, the day's gone away from you. Time is a real factor.

Time is perceived as an obstacle affecting supervision by almost all supervisors in all patterns -- whether they spend one hour a week or five hours a day observing and conferring with teachers. The dilemma of the supervisor in the patterned system seems to cause the most conflict, though. Educational supervisors seem to supervise between 20 and 75 teachers -- the most reported in these interviews was 75, by a supervisor in an integrated system. The median number of teachers reported

supervised by the 52 supervisors who completed the SSP (Goldsberry, et al., 1984) was 31. Given this supervisory load (although in the patterned districts we studied not all teachers were supervised each year) and the "multi-hat" perception of the role, supervisors in patterned districts often seemed most frustrated by the limits of time.

DEFINITION 3: Integrated supervision combines patterned supervision with other approaches to professional development and adapts the process to the specific needs of the setting and teachers served.

S: My idea of supervision is that supervision is ongoing teacher training. If you want teachers to learn, you've constantly got to keep them up to date with the current research. You've got to keep them refreshed with all kinds of things...I've got a crew of master teachers. I send them out a great deal to do staff development in other school districts...I must have 30 or 40 percent that are top notch master teachers.

S: We have sort of an open kind of approach where we're not feeling that anyone needs to work behind closed doors...Our inservice is an example. It's very much hands-on -- for the next day. For example, if there's a problem we can have an afternoon inservice or an evening inservice where a teacher, or teachers, and a consultant work through the problem, implement it for the next couple of days, and go on -- rather than "we'll do this in the summer and hope something happens in the following year." So I think that's the other thing that makes it okay to open yourself up -- on the part of adults, and of course, we expect this of kids.

HYPOTHESIS 5: Integrated supervision is rare and much more likely to occur in elementary schools.

HYPOTHESIS 6: Teachers supervised in an integrated system are more likely to report that supervision received is helpful for improving teaching.

The only two sites we categorized as integrated were both restricted to findings from elementary school supervisors. Diablo School District was the one included as part of the Harvey and Goldsberry (1984) study of elementary supervision --no interviews of Diablo secondary school supervisors were conducted.

All reviewers agreed in independent ratings of interviews that supervision was "integrated" only in Elbe elementary schools. No rater categorized any district's approach to supervision in secondary schools as integrated. Moreover, the 1984 Harvey and Goldsberry study focused on two elementary sites in which teachers' responses on the SSP regarding the helpfulness of supervision were significantly and favorably different from the rest. Not only did teachers perceive supervision to be more helpful in districts using an integrated approach, but supervisors were apt to view more teachers as "master teachers" than in districts using nominal or pattern approaches to supervision.

S: I would say a third to 45 percent (of the teachers I supervise) I would consider master teachers.

S: I suspect if you compared...my faculty members to a typical school across the state..., I'd probably have at least half that you call master teachers. If you compare then (within this district), I think it's fair to say...about a third to a half would be master teachers... And, I'm talking about people that could diagnose and plan curriculum, and really work from scratch...To me a master teacher doesn't use commercial manuals and just put together somebody else's stuff.

Nowhere but in districts using an integrated approach were so many teachers considered "masters." Of course, several explanations might account for this phenomenon. Perhaps districts who are blessed with a great number of expert classroom teachers can afford the latitude of an integrated approach to supervision. Perhaps those recognized as by "masters" self and others demand an integrated approach. Perhaps districts using an integrated approach to supervision have a covert and mutual "appreciation" plan -- an unspoken norm that all educators in the district speak well of other educators. Perhaps districts with integrated approaches to supervision do a better job of attracting and retaining "master" teachers. Perhaps the integrated approach actually contributes to the development of expert

teaching. Perhaps some districts truly value expert teaching more than other districts and this value permeates the system influencing both teachers and supervisors. While we have not been hesitant to go beyond our data to suggest hypotheses we think plausible, we do not feel comfortable choosing from among these possible explanations a single, "most likely" candidate. We are partial to the last one, but suspect some interaction among several of those listed (and probably a few we didn't include) is probably the case. We would like to believe that the integrated approach to supervision is at least partly responsible for better teaching, but, at least at this time, that is more a conclusion of faith than of research. We continue our investigations.

HYPOTHESIS 7: A supervisor in any setting conceives of supervision as either a set of tasks which are part of the job, or as a personal duty, a part of a personal commitment to education of youth, which makes the job personally meaningful.

In their popular best seller on management, In Search of Excellence: Lessons from American's Best-Run Companies, Peters and Waterman (1982) suggest that successful enterprises are innovative and that "champions," leaders who believe strongly and who act intensely, are essential for innovation. We believe some, though not many, of the supervisors we interviewed were "champions" -- they were committed to the enterprise of educating young people and were persistent and intense in their efforts. They also exuded confidence -- not naive and blind faith that everything either was, or soon would be, wonderful; rather an unmistakable sense that their efforts would produce meaningful change. These supervisory "champions" were convinced that the majority of teachers they worked with were already good, and with support would get even better.

S: ...It should be very clear to the staff that (supervision is) a support system and that supervisors are only in the classroom to strengthen the skills of them personally...It has to be very clear to work -- to be a support system and really a service to them — that we're working for the classroom teacher; they're not working for us.

Conversely, many of the supervisors we interviewed seemed either resigned to the fact that reality prevents meaningful supervision or sometimes frustrated to the point of bitterness.

S: ...Ideally, I would like to say that clinical supervision would be the large basis of supervision. Realistically, I'm not so sure that can happen with the ratio of administrators and teachers.

I: If one of your best friend's children told you he or she were considering a career in education, and aspired to someday have a job like yours, what would you advise him or her?

S: Well, I had a daughter who was an accelerated student, a gifted student, and when it came time for her to go to college, I told her — her College Boards were 1450 — I told her, "You could go to any college in the world, and I will pay — unless you majored in education." Does that answer your question?

I: It sure does.

HYPOTHESIS 8: Supervisors in districts using an integrated approach to supervision are more likely than their counterparts in districts using nominal or patterned approaches to express a "champion" sense of duty.

HYPOTHESIS 9: A "champion" supervisor cannot long endure in a district without adequate conditions for meaningful supervision.

Whether districts with an integrated approach are more likely to develop or attract a "champion," or that a "champion" supervisor can help establish an integrated approach within a district, the "integrated/champion" match seems evident. It may well be that "executive champions," another Peters and Waterman term, are responsible for the transitions we discussed in the districts using a

patterned approach. If so, the evolution to an integrated approach in these districts may be further fueled by modeling the "champion" intensity for leadership.

But what happens to a "champion" in a district where the job descriptions of the designated supervisors are so expansive as to legitimize, even mandate, the role as "jack of all trades"? Is it possible that some school districts, like Avery, are so sparsely staffed as to preclude any chance of meaningful supervision? We think so. The "champion" of supervision in these cases must either resolve to alter the environment, or, facing futility there, leave. Some resign and seek greener pastures; some seem to resign themselves and stay. In such cases it seems inevitable that supervision become a mandated task with little personal meaning. What becomes of duty is a question for further scrutiny.

References

Alphonso, R.J., Firth, G.R. and Neville, R.F. (1975). Instructional Supervision: A Behavior System. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Goldsberry, L., Harvey, P.L., Hoffman, N. Levin, J., Badiali, B. and Vadella, R. (1984). The Survey of Supervisory Practices. Symposium presented at the 1984 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Hammarskjold, Dag. (1966). Markings. New York: Knopf.

Harvey, P.L. and Goldsberry, L. (1984). Job-embedded Staff Development: The Information of Coaching on Teachers and Their Supervisors. Paper presented at the 1984 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research, Association, New Orleans.

Harvey, P. L. Goldsberry, L. and Mayer, R. H. (1985). The Building Principal as Supervisor: Perceptions of the Job and Its Problems. Paper presented at the 1985 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Lovell, J. T. (1978). Instructional Supervision: Emerging Perspective. Part of a report by the ASCD Working Group on the Roles and Responsibilities of Supervisors. (Mimeographed).

Peters, T. J. and Waterman, R. H. (1982). In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best-run Companies. New York: Harper & Row.

Sergiovanni, T. J. and Starratt, R. J. (1983). Supervision: Human Perspectives. (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Sullivan, C. G. (1980). Clinical Supervision, A State of the Art Review. Alexandria, Va: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

APPENDIX A

THE STRUCTURED INTERVIEW

Study of Supervisory Practices

TIER 2 -- Interview

Introductory comments -- Before the official interview, the respondent will be greeted in an informal fashion, the purpose of the phone call discussed, the convenience of the timing verified, and the audio-taping mentioned.

Section 1: You understand this interview is being taped to provide a complete and accurate record of the interview. No one will be identified by name and all reporting of data will be anonymous. Your participation is voluntary and you have the right to withdraw from the interview at any time. Do you have any questions before we begin the interview?

Section 2: Demographic Data

1. What is your current job title?
2. How many years have you been in your current position?
3. How many years have you served as a supervisor?
4. How many years did you supervise during the target school year mentioned in the survey?
5. At what grade levels were the teachers you supervised?

5a. If elementary, how many buildings were you responsible for?

5b. If secondary, for what academic subjects were you responsible?

Section 3: Process of Supervision

1. Approximately how many hours each week do you formally observe teaching?
2. How many times a year do you observe each teacher? (Tenure/nontenure? Every teacher the same?)
3. How long do these formal observations usually last?
4. Do you ever meet with teachers prior to the observation to discuss the observation?

4a. If yes, how frequently? How long? Purpose of meeting?

5. Do you ever meet with teachers after the observation to discuss the observation?

5a. If yes, how frequently? How long? Purpose of meeting?

6. Is a written summary of the observation prepared?

6a. If so, always? By whom? Before or after the conference? For what purpose?

7. Of the ____ teachers you supervise, approximately how many are:

master teachers? good/adequate? need improvement?

Section 4: I am going to read to you eight purposes that have been associated with supervision in schools. After each I would like you to tell me if in your opinion this statement is very important, important, or unimportant for supervision?

1. To identify teachers whose performance is unsatisfactory.

2. To get a better handle on what's going on in my school.

3. To insure the curriculum is delivered as designed. (What does curriculum mean to you?)

4. To provide assistance to teachers who request it.

5. To identify master teachers.

6. To help teachers analyze and improve their teaching.

7. To establish an environment where teachers feel comfortable to request help in analyzing and improving teaching.

8. To perform the required ritual of personnel evaluation. (How helpful is this?)

Transition item: How many of the teachers you supervised during the target school year do you feel have changed their teaching because of your supervision?

(1) Almost All (2) Most (3) Some (4) Almost None

Section 5: Open Ended Questions

1. As you see it, what are the major problems or obstacles to affect the supervision in your school?

2. What kind of preparation did you have for the direct supervision of instruction? Please describe both college courses and on-the-job experiences which helped prepare you to supervise teachers. How effective do you think this preparation was? Why?

3. Given the conditions you have to work in, what are your objectives for supervision?

4. Please describe a typical observation cycle.

5. Earlier you mentioned that ____ members of your faculty are master teachers and ____ needed improvement. How does the suprvision for these two groups of teachers differ?

6. Describe supervision as you think it should be. How should supervision function in the schools ideally?

7. Given the conditions you have to work in, is supervision a doable job?

8. If one of your best friend's children told you he or she was considering a career in education and aspired to someday have a job like yours, what would you advise him or her?

APPENDIX B

SELECTED COMMENTS

APPENDIX B-1

NOMINALIST POSITION

I: Approximately how many hours each week do you formally observe teaching?

S: Well, of course, it varies, but I would say in the formal observation -- some weeks I say none, other weeks I would say two at the most.

I: How many times a year do you observe each teacher?

S: It depends on the teacher. Every teacher is observed at least once. The state law requires that. Other teachers, especially new teachers, are observed when they need it -- four or five times depending on their needs. And, if I observe an older teacher, an experienced teacher and see things that I may draw their attention to, I often go back. Now, as far as this being a formal observation, I can't say that it really is because it's the second time through with an experienced teacher and it might only be ten minutes.

I: How long do these formal observations usually last? Now, you said the follow-up ones might be ten or fifteen minutes, but the first one, how long would you say that formal observations usually last.

S: Okay. Sometimes the first observation -- for example, this year it's shorter. For example, this year one of the things I'm taking particular note to is getting to the class -- various ways teachers start class -- if there's a definite starting point in items such as this. In that case, those teachers I have observed this year I have observed maybe ten or fifteen minutes at the beginning of the period. If I go in for a formal observation that they're going to sign, I always go in for the full period.

I: Okay, 45 minutes. Do you ever meet with the teacher prior to the observation to discuss the observation with them?

S: This year I have done that in some cases. But, in most cases and in past years I did not do that.

I: You say you did it this year -- you do it sometimes this year. How long would that meeting be? That preobservation meeting.

S: The preobservation meeting might be five minutes.

I: And, what would you say the purpose of that meeting is?

S: Just so the teacher knows that I'm going to come in for a short period of time. So they don't expect that I'm in there the whole period. Also, to let them know it's not a formal, long-term, "this-is-it," final observation. It's just that I'm coming in to pick out some items that I want them to take notice to. (Emphasis added.)

I: Do you ever meet with the teachers after the observation to discuss the observation?

S: Yes.

I: And how long would those meetings be?

S: It depends. Never less than twenty minutes -- sometimes longer.

I: Up to like 45 minutes? Because of the periods?

S: I don't think anyone has ever gone 45 minutes. I don't think we've ever gone bell-to-bell. We've been close.

I: And, what would you say the purpose of that meeting is?

S: So that we have a complete understanding of why I was there — and if I have any questions on what I think I saw — and if they have any questions they want to ask me about their own teaching. A lot of times it's -- I try to be very supportive at that time and tell them I think they're doing a good job and so forth. And, if they have any problems, (I want them) to bring them to my attention.

I: Is a written summary of the observation prepared?

S: No. Well, wait. A written summary, no. I take notes and share those notes with them — of the observation. When I go into the observation, sit down — I have a form. Our district has a form -- I've never used that, of course, when I'm in there. I use my own form I picked up someplace. And it has a lot of check-offs -- you know, lighting, ventilation, and physical things such as that. And I go over that and make notes on it. And usually I have may be anywhere form three to eight sentences that I write about the teacher or suggestions I have made.

S: ...There are a lot of different things I use in personnel evaluation. Everything from how cooperative a teacher is, whether or not a teacher takes care of some of the sundry duties — such as handing back forms that (are) necessary for the kids to fill out and so forth. I think really a (study) says there's a correlation between how much cooperation and how skillful a teacher is in getting the information back to the office that the office may want — there's a correlation between that and how good the teacher is. I found out that teachers who are slip-shoddy in one area are in other areas.

I: As you see it, what are the major problems or obstacles to affect the supervision in your school?

S: Not only in my school, but I think in a lot of secondary schools, the main problem is having the personnel to do it. (At) this school I do not have an assistant under me. And many times if I don 't say, "I'm observing; I don't want to be disturbed," I'm disturbed. And, I think a lot of principals may say that also. I know there are school districts who hire people who do nothing but supervision at the secondary level, and I think that particularly is the way to go. This district does not see it that way. This district says we want a principal to do a lot of supervision, but — as anyone should know — the principal has a lot of managing and (has to deal with) so many problems (that) you can't really address yourself to saying that supervision is — today I'm going to be a supervisor — or at the third period every day — or whatever.

S: My overall objective is to apply or provide an environment so that the students can learn. And sometimes that's not just supervision; sometimes, that comes

into discipline in school. Also, I think that most teachers I've ever observed have felt that even though — you know, I've never gone in and said, "Look, I walk on water." I'm a supervisor here, but the teachers I've talked to — in the way I handle the teachers and the observation — they feel good about themselves afterwards. And, as I said at the beginning, I like to be very supportive of the teacher. I do have that type of personality. If people were doing things that I don't consider sound educational practices, I tell them up front. And so my teachers know me as — Maybe I talk straight from the shoulder, but they know I'm truthful and consequently, when I say they've done a good job, they obviously believe they've done a good job.

I: If one of your best friend's children told you he or she were considering a career in education, and aspired to someday have a job like yours, what would you advise him or her?

S: Well, I had a daughter who was an accelerated student, a gifted student, and when it came time for her to go to college, I told her — her College Boards were 1450 — I told her, "You could go to any college in the world, and I will pay — unless you majored in education." Does that answer your question.

I: It sure does.

APPENDIX B-2

IDEAL SUPERVISION

INTEGRATED VIEW

I: Describe supervision as you think it should be in the school. Ideally. You could, in other words, say, "All right, I'm going to supervise and this is how I am going to do it." Regardless of any restraints that might be imposed.

S: I don't think there are any restraints to begin with, at all ... There is a Teacher's Association ... I feel more constraints from them in how I might go about it. I don't feel ...

I: Is time frustrating?

S: Time is. But, I think if we ... what we feel we need to do and what we really want to do, we get done. So, time is not a restriction. There is no restraint from the plan, there's certainly no restraint from my bosses... There aren't any real significant constraints.

I: So, how would you describe ideal supervision — or what you consider ideal?

S: (At this point, this principal describes Goldhammer's approach to clinical supervision — mentioning Goldhammer's name. She/He indicates it is both what she/he considers ideal, and what she/he practices.)

I: How od you think supervision should function in the schools? Ideally. Describe several ways that you think it should be.

S: The way we're doing it... It should be very clear to the staff that it's a support system and that supervisors are only in the classroom to strengthen the skills of them personally... It has to be very clear to work -- to be a support system and really a service to them — that we're really working for the classroom teacher; they're not working for us.

I: I'd like you to describe supervision as you think it should be; how supervision should function in school ideally. Maybe you can answer that for me -- if you had your ideal -- although I guess what I'm getting at is that it really sounds as if you are doing what you believe in and what you feel is how things should function.

S: I don't want to be redundant, so sort of keep in mind what we talked about. The one thing I would add that I wanted to do more with — and, again, it would be selectively because we want to do it well — and that is I want to do more clinical supervision...

I: How would that differ from what you've talked about?

S: It would be a little more specific and might involve me a little more directly. It would be more systematic, I think... I need time and finally I have the time to begin to do some of that because I'm evaluating fewer people.

PATTERNED VIEW

I: How do you think supervision really should be? How would it function in schools ideally?

S: My opinion of clinical supervision is that clinical supervision should be done by somebody other than the principal. I think somebody else should do the supervision other than the person assigned to (complete the official evaluation rating form). We discussed having it done with peers and that has some merit -- to do that. If we can get people to do it and the time to do it.

I: Would you describe supervision as it should be? How do you think supervision should function in schools, ideally?

S: Well, I guess I see some of the same kinds of things happening that are happening now. I would like to see teachers have more flexibility or more opportunity to invite peers into their classrooms, particularly to visit other classrooms to see how other people are doing things -- with the same kinds of students, or even the same students they are working with. I think to see other techniques used and other subject matter used with that same group of students may help teachers to at least become interested in other ways of doing things.

I: Does any of this occur in your school now?

S: Very, very little.

I: But this is something that you would like to see happen?

S: Very much like to see happen.

I: The next question I think you have answered somewhat so if you'd just like to give me a short answer -- It's talking about how you would describe supervision functioning in schools ideally.

S: Well, again, I think it has to be -- Ideally, I would like to say that clinical supervision would be the large basis of supervision. Realistically, I'm not so sure that can happen with the ratio of administrators and teachers.

I: Given those conditions, then, do you think that supervision is doable? Can it be accomplished?

S: ... Yes, it is. I think I'm excited about the idea of peer supervision as far as what it can do for teachers... I think what we have to do, too, and I think I've done it with some success this year, is not to forget to let teachers know when they're doing a good job. I had one teacher -- I believe that "thank you" is a very small price to pay. I wrote a memo and I thanked him for the job that he had done -- not only for me, but for the kids. And, he came into my office and he was so surprised. He said, "You know, you're the first person that ever thanked me." ... If we want good teachers, we'd better let the good ones know that we appreciate what they're doing, because obviously financially we can't compete. And I think we have to let them know we do appreciate what they're doing.

S: I really think it has got to start at the top. I think there has to be some kind of committee at the top — probably consisting of school board members, consisting of representatives of the teachers' association and representatives of the higher administration and administrators from the building level... (Teachers must) feel they are a part of the process without having that process imposed totally upon them by our side of the fence

---

NOMINAL VIEW

I: Describe supervision as you think it should be. How should it function in schools ideally?

S: Ideally? I'd like to get in to see every teacher every week. Totally impossible, but ideally. And, if we want a real continuity of an instructional situation, every week or every other week. I wouldn't push it past that.

...

S: Well, I think that it needs to be designed to improve instruction for teachers. I think that is the primary design of it. And I think that principals must work with that idea in mind and with that objective in mind. I think you have to stop and look and evaluate your entire instructional program and narrow it down to two particular areas. And I think through observation and through helping teachers, you have to improve any weak areas you have.

****

APPENDIX B-3

MAJOR OBSTACLES

INTEGRATED VIEW

I: What do you see as the major problems or obstacles to effective supervision in schools?

S: I suppose it's skill of supervising. I'm not sure how much success I'd have had...in a situation where we're really concerned with half the faculty, for example. I've no idea how successful I could be with turning something like that around. It's (this faculty) an easy group to supervise.

I: As you see it, what are the major problems or obstacles to effective supervision in your schools?

S: Geographics and time constraints.

I: Would you say that those are two of the major problems?

S: Yes. I'd like to be able to spend even more time with them, and more time in the classrooms. If you're trying to give attention to people, the time and geographics can become a constraint. (NOTE: This supervisor reports spending between four and five hours each day formally observing teaching. He/She supervises 75 teachers in 12 different buildings.)

I: Are there any other problems you encounter?

S: Not too many others. Those two are the big ones.

I: As you see it, what are the major problems or obstacles for supervision in your schools?

S: Say that again.

I: If you were going to list some of the problems or obstacles for supervision in your schools, what would you say are the main obstacles?

S: Minimal staff. We need more staff so that we can get into the classroom at a higher rate. Although I think our rate is good, it could be better.

I: As you see it, what are the major problems or obstacles to effective supervision in your schools?

S: I think one of them is the number of teachers I have to work with. (62) As I just stated, I can't key in on maybe some specific things I'd like to with the group of teachers. I think our distance is difficult because we do have forty-two miles between two of our schools and it's a very large geographic area...I think these are probably two of the most difficult things.

I: As you see it, what major problems or obstacles affect supervision in your school? Or are there any?

S: ...Time is certainly a factor. The older you get, you know you know more but you also know that you can't do it all — and maybe that's been healthy for me as I've gotten older...Every day you might have twenty things you might have to do and only time to do ten. Each ten count. And, that's what I've had to do.

PATTERNED VIEW

I: As you see it, what are the major problems or obstacles that affect supervision in your school?

S: Time. My time.

I: Your time. You mean that an hour a day is hard to find? (NOTE: This supervisor had previously stated she/he devoted about an hour a day to formal classroom observation.)

S: It's not enough. It's almost impossible.

I: Do you have any other obstacles you see?

S: (The teachers' union.) They think teachers are hostile to it.

I: Why, I wonder.

S: They take a look at what you're doing and they're afraid of ratings and what you're going to do with them, and so on. It can build up over the years.

I: What are the major obstacles to effective supervision in your school?

S: Okay, I think time demand on the principal is a major factor.

I: Would that be one of the primary obstacles as you see it?

S: Yes, it would be one of the primary ones. I don't know if it would be the primary factor, but it would probably be right up at the top.

I: What else would be an obstacle?

S: Let's see. I think contract negotiations is a factor.

I: How does that affect supervision? Do you feel it limits it?

S: Well, I think it just creates a little tension, you know — as the supervision, especially the clinical supervision, you know, really requires an openness, you know, and I don't know whether that situation in a contract tends to foster that kind of thing. It may be a factor — I'm not convinced that it totally is, it may not be — but I think it's a concern .

I: As you see it, what are the major problems or obstacles to effective supervision in your school? What I'd like you to do is to list as many as you can think of and then to prioritize the top three obstacles.

S: The school district is seeking to make all of the classroom or grade-level sequencing of materials and so forth, uniform at each grade level. I think that this gets in the way of encouraging teachers rally to try other subject matter to accomplish the same kinds of skills.

I: And that would affect the way you would be able to ...

S: To be able to relate and to really -- I think you have to change a number of things to get teachers to change. Sometimes getting a new subject matter gets them really willing to experiment with some different techniques when they're deeply in a rut with other kinds of things that are gong on.

I: Are there are other obstacles that you see to supervision?

S: Time and paper work.

I: Okay, anything else?

S: I guess that would really cover most of them.

I: Okay, I'm assuming that since you talked about standardization of curriculum, that that would be the largest obstacles that you are seeing?

S: Yes, it is.

I: As you see it, what are the major problems or obstacles that affect the supervision in your school?

S: Well, I think time constraints on the job itself -- the supervision and we're responsible for administering -- that's what takes up most of the time.

I: The common response. What about any other things you can come up with? Are there some other things that have an impact?

S: ... Well, I suppose I'd have to say too that there's not enough teacher input into overall willingness or maybe they don't feel a willingness to have a supervision program with input.

I: So they don't really have enough input?

S: No.

I: Are there any other things you can come up with that you feel are major problems?

S: I think when I said administration, I'm speaking about everything else. Basically, it's time.

I: As you see it, what are the major problems or obstacles to affect the supervision in your school? You can list as many of them as you'd like and prioritize what you see as the top three.

S: The first obstacle is obvious and that is ... time is a definite problem. ...I have a great deal of difficulty planning time because I have to deal with emergencies every day. And, in the middle school, believe me (there) are emergencies every day.... Secondly, the problem that I have is a threat that we obviously have. And, I think we have to spend more time with teachers taking away the threat of the (mandatory evaluation/rating form)... There are a lot of teachers who aren't that competent. They're not sure of themselves and obviously that threatening to them is a factor we can't dismiss.

S: I see the dichotomy existing between teachers and administration, and I see a strong sense of labor management...I'm talking about the union, the association and management. It's there, and the instrument (the state version of the evaluation/rating form) is there, and that is a problem. The teachers have a hard time of getting down to the level of trust with us because they see themselves as labor and they see us as management — they see that (state form) between us. And, furthermore, ...we have not characteristically involved our teachers in establishing the criteria for observation, or for rating them. Now the criteria are all generated by management, which is us, and then we impose the supervision and judgment upon our teachers... And, I think as long as that is the case, we're gong to have resistance from the teachers.

I: As you see it, what are the major problems or obstacles that affect supervision in your school? For you it's really "in your schools."

S: Yes, that's the problem I'm dealing with. It's a personal thing that I'm dealing with, and I'm not real comfortable about this thing put in any written form. Okay?

I: Anything — We would not put anything down that anyone could saywas from you.

S: All right. Given the fact that I deal with three schools, okay, I am not there all the time..My greatest obstacle (is) being in one place...I'm not there on need if the teacher wants to call me in for this particular lesson or something. And, I find that to be a hardship in my current situation. And, I'm sure you're running across other people who have two or three schools.

I: Yeah. I ran across a fellow not too long ago in (another) district who had three or four schools. Well, he had three, and he was adding a fourth next year. He was not happy, and I don't blame him. It's very difficult. I taught in a situation where the principal had four buildings, and, you know, there's a rule that says you will be in (one school) when you're needed in (another). Do you see any other things that have an effect on it?

S: Time.

I: Why is time such a problem?

S: With the various and sundry things that happen during the day, you are a problem-solver and, the number one job I think, trouble shooter. You've got to cure all the little ills of the day — and, by the time that's done, all of a sudden, the day's gone away from you. Time is a real factor.

NOMINAL VIEW

S: Well, I guess one of the obstacles is time. Be able to get in and observe each teacher as often as we'd like to.

S: Well, the attitude of the teachers would be one. They have to be accepting and I think they are, now. Time is another.

I: Any other problems you see, or are those basically it?

S: Training. Those would be the three.

S: Not only in my school, but I think in a lot of secondary schools, the main problem is having the personnel to do it. (At) this school I do not have an assistant under me. And many times if I don't say, "I'm observing; I don't want to be disturbed," I'm disturbed. And, I think a lot of principals may say that also. I know there are school districts who hire people who do nothing but supervision at the secondary level, and I think that particularly is the way to go. This district does not see it that way. This district says we want a principal to do a lot of supervision, but — as anyone should know — the principal has a lot of managing and (has to deal with) so many problems (that) you can't really address yourself to saying that supervision is -- today I'm going to be a supervision — or at the third period every day — or whatever.

S: The time constraints on the principal.

I: Do you see any other problem or major obstacle — or is that it?

S: That, I think, is the chief problem, I really do. I think that other problems can be surmounted.

S: The major obstacles are strikes the past two years -- (clashes between teachers) and management.

S: I don't have enough help. I'm the — just about everything. I take care of discipline, curriculum — just name it; that's about it.

S: Probably one is all the extra-curricular work that we have to do in the office (like) making up reports.

APPENDIX B-4

CHANGE

INTEGRATED VIEW

I: How many of the teachers that you supervise do you feel have changed their teaching because of the supervision? ...Almost all of them, most of them, none of them?

S: A few. I think that most of the changes come about through the staff development project.

I: You're saying that it's not just from you. Is that what I'm hearing?

S: Oh, definitely. Not just me.

I: It's from ...?

S: Colleagues and the atmosphere, the things that we've talked about ...and personal interest and motivation. I think a lot of it comes about from that, too.

I: Have you noticed that changes are occurring because of these conferences and observations?

S: Yes. Our testing data and our achievement tests show that ....

I: How many of the teachers you supervised last year ... do you feel have changed their teaching because of your supervision? Do you think almost all of them changed, most, some almost none?

S: I think most. Sometimes they're not even aware of the changes they make. I feel, frankly, that many times I see signs of things that happen as a result of the supervisory packet that they get on a monthly basis. And, you know, they're very willing to say, "Hey, that really has some neat things in it. Look what I did." And when I went over their evaluation of me, so many of them wrote on ...that they were really grateful for that information, and enjoyed reading it. I keep it short -- brief and sketchy. Something I know they'll at least glance at. So, you know, if I judge from that response, I'd have to say most of them.

I: ...are willing to change their behavior?

S: Yes. They're very willing. Really, truly. I have almost an ideal situation.

I: How many of the teachers who were supervised ... last year actually changed their teaching because of supervision?

S: I would hope a hundred percent, but I would suspect it's more like seventy-five percent.

I: So you'd say most of the teachers?

S: Not necessarily in a dramatic way, but very subtle ways. They've smoothed out some other techniques through discussion with supervisors.

I: How many teachers during the 1981-82 school year, or in general, do you feel have changed their teaching because of your supervision? All of them, most of them, some of them, none of them?

S: I guess I'd have to say some of them. When you have 60 some teachers, you get out as much as you can. You don't always feel you have the impact, and the continuity and follow-up that you'd like.

I: How many of the teachers you supervised during that schoo year do you feel have changed their teaching because of the system, the process that you and they worked together?

S: I'm a little vague about 1981-82. As I remember back, I had more new people then. I probably had two or three people ... that you could say would be relatively new or brand new. And, without question, there has been a great deal of changes. I see that. So I think that most people that were dirctly supervised would have been making some of those changes. Now to the degree that they changed, it would be hard to speculate — but I think there was change.

PATTERNED VIEW

I: How many of the teachers you supervised during the past year do you feel have changed their teaching because of your supervision? Almost all, most, some, almost none?

S: Some.

S. Some.

S: Some.

I: How many of the teachers you supervised during the past year do you feel have changed their teaching because of your supervision? And, we've got four groups here. Almost all, most, some, almost none?

S: I'd like to say some...but I think that's based on the teachers agreeing again beforehand the things needed to be changed or ... for some reason wanted to try something and then saw a need to change.

I: So, you're talking about changes that were, in part, teacher initiated?

S: Well, certainly. They're not going to change just for me or for any supervisor.

I: How many teachers that you supervised in the 1981-82 school year do you feel actually changed their teaching because of their supervision?

S: It's a difficult question.

I: Well, how about if you say almost all of them, most of them, some of them?

S: I think most of them.

S: It would probably be somewhere between some and almost none — those who have actually changed their teaching.

S: I guess I would say some.

S: I'd say some.

NOMINAL VIEW

S: I think I'd have to qualify that. I would say almost all of the teachers that I have wanted to change made made an attempt at change.

S. Some.

S. I would say most.

S. Some.

S. I would say some.

OTHER COMMENTS

INTEGRATED VIEW

S: My idea of supervision is that supervision in ongoing teacher training.

S: If you want teachers to learn, you've constantly got to keep them up to date with the current research. You've got to keep them refreshed with all kinds of things.

S: I've got a crew of master teachers. I send them out a great deal to do staff development in other school districts...I must have 30 or 40 percent that are top notch master teachers.

S: I would say a third to forty-five percent I would consider master teachers.

S: I'd probably say 20 (of 62 teachers supervised were master teachers).

S: Probably the teachers themselves feel like they have a lot more input into the system and into the decision-making than they would have in some (other) district.

S: The school district's evaluation plan ... involves a model where, instead of going in and supervising the person, you meet with the evaluatee, set a goal for the year, and objectives. The person —It's a participatory kind of thing. There's a self-analysis at first on the teacher's part. The principal's part is to help the teacher come up with the growth areas and to identify them and plan to promote or mediate them. And, then there's a process involved where the objectives sort of state what we're going to be doing for the year, October through May. And then, it's quite easy for the principal to monitor the person's objective, what they're working on. The evaluation occurs once every three years for a tenured person ... A nontenured person would be evaluated two years in a row, of course, four observations ... leading up to tenure.

S: My role is that of supervisor but I help where I can. We have consultants who will help teachers, they can choose to have other teachers help them, but the point is our evaluation process is a growth oriented, positive one versus what I would call a supervision model of coming in and cutting someone down ... I go in with the idea that I want to look at the broader picture — how everything is going. And then, I want to offer suggestion and, many times, compliments if it's going well. I think sometimes we don't get enough of that' we tend to be a society that zeros is on the negative.

S: We have sort of an open kind of approach where we're not feeling that anyone needs to work behind closed doors...Our inservice is an example. It's very much hands-on — for the next day. For example, if there's a problem we can have an afternoon inservice or an evening inservice where a teacher, or teachers, and a consultant work through the problem, implement it

the next couple of days,and go on — rather than 'we'll do this in the summer and hope something happens in the following.' So I think that's the other thing that makes it okay to open yourself up — on the part of adults and, of course, we expect this of kids.

S: I suspect if you compared ... my faculty members to a typical school across the state ..., I'd probably have at least half that you call master teachers. If you compare then (within this district), I think it's fair to say ... about a third to a half would be master teachers... And, I'm talking about people that could diagnose and plan curriculum, and really work from scratch... To me a master teacher doesn't use commercial manual and just put together somebody else's stuff.

S: We have a set of (evaluation) standards. The first step is for the teacher to evaluate him or herself in terms of those standards.Then ...the general routine is to have a pre-evaluation conference. The teacher comes in with that self-assessment and we go over it. If the evaluator has any specific concerns, they are stated at that time....

PATTERNED VIEW

S: — When I want to work with somebody with clinical supervision, I ask anything about teaching they dislike — or is there anything about the classroom teaching part that they don't like. That bugs them, you know.

I: Sort of a problem-solving thing?

S: Right. So that we can kind of work together on it. Or, sometimes, going in to observe them when they knew I was coming and if I see something that bothered me, I'll ask them if it bothered them -- you know, that that happened. Would they like to work on that, you know, with me.

S: I would say probably no more than ten percent (of the 22 teachers I supervise) are master teachers — and, probably, adequate would ... run seventy percent. That would leave about twenty percent that would need improvement, that definitely need help.

S: What happens is... our superintendent has put a lot of pressure on us and has made (classroom observation) a top priority. So, some other stuff has gone by the wayside because he has a high priority. Therefore, we have to do it. I do what I'm told.

I: Yes, but it doesn't sound like you're doing too bad a job if you can get any of it in.

S: Yeah, and we'd better get it in. That's the way he is. He's a very domineering individual and he is the superintendent. And, he is the boss and he wants it done, so you do it.

S: "I think my primary objective would be to help people improve their teaching. I see improvement as the cornerstone, you know. That's very general — very broad. And, what you mean about improvement is probably -- everyone has their own opinion about that. But I really see that as a supervisor you're in a very crucial position to try to influence people — you know, to help them improve and ultimately provide a good education for these kids. I feel that's where the bottom line is here."

I: Do you view supervision as a doable job under the conditions of your work?

S: ... No, I don't. I think I put the time in at it because I'm required to do it and we do have ... I guess it goes back to that old term — we're "snoopervision" supervisors.

S: What you need to get to, in my opinion and I've talked to a lot of administrators who share this opinion, is we need to get to those people who need help. They will be reluctant, but I think we need to get to them.

S: I think the most important thing as far as we're concerned is to self-analyze. I think the improvement will come by their (the teachers) own efforts, but I think if we have analyzed and pointed out the weaknesses, then I think it becomes a very important part of the teacher's job to — if possible, to suggest ways they can improve it.

NOMINAL VIEW

I: Given the conditions you have to work in, what are your objectives for supervision then?

S: ...Let's take an example. I have three different people teaching 10th grade English. I feel that I am obliged to see to it that all those different kids are getting the same dose of medicine.

S: ...The law says we have to observe (nontenured teachers) twice (a year) and the other teachers once. I pop in the classroom and maybe just spend ten minutes. And, I don't have that much information, but I would say that on the average — I don't do as much as I should because I'm also athletic director, transportation director, and anything else (in addition to being high school principal) — I probably average ... three (observations of) ... any teacher who is not tenured, and probably at the most, two (observations of other teachers). That might be a little bit high on the older teachers — teachers that I've had teaching for 34 years. There's no way I'm going to be spending a lot of time with them.

****